

March 5, 2003

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Gregg A. Galecki, Sr. Reclamation Specialist

RE: 2002 Fourth Quarter Water Monitoring, West Ridge Resource Inc., West Ridge Mine, C/007/041-WQ02-4

- 1. Were data submitted for all of the MRP required sites?** YES [x] NO [ ]

*Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:*

- 2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.**

*See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.*

**Resampling Due Date**

Commitment to samples every fifth year, beginning with the first mid-term review (p. 7-20): first mid-term due 10/01/01. The next baseline sampling will be conducted by 10/01/06.

- 3. Were all required parameters reported for each site?** YES [ X ] NO [ ]

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

Of a total 18 monitoring sites, twelve (12) sites showed no flow or not enough flow to collect a sample. Of the eight (8) total springs monitored, two (2) sites were dry and three (3) had only sufficient flow for field parameters only. This likely indicates the springs are experiencing 'baseline' flows. All sites were accessible.

**4. Were irregularities found in the data?**

YES [ x ]      NO [   ]

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

The depth to water at Well DH-86-2, which increased approximately 14.5-ft from 1998 through March 2001, has now dropped approximately 45-ft. since March 2001. Water levels dropped an additional 2.2-feet from the 3<sup>rd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> quarter. Construction work conducted around the well lowered the surface casing approximately 5-ft from the 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter 2001, accounted for some of the variance noted earlier. The well monitors the Sunnyside Member of the Blackhawk Formation, which is below the coal seam being mined. It is drilled to approximately the 6885-ft elevation. The Division debated whether it was necessary to better characterize the water in the well with age-dating analysis. It was determined that since no surface or groundwater rights could be affected in the immediate area, that additional characterization was not warranted. With the exception of drop in water level, the other water quality parameters remain stable and unchanged at the well.

No other irregularities were found in the data.

**5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?**

1<sup>st</sup> month,    YES [ x ]    NO [   ]  
2<sup>nd</sup> month,    YES [ x ]    NO [   ]  
3<sup>rd</sup> month,    YES [ x ]    NO [   ]

*Identify sites and months not monitored:*

Both D001 and D002 showed no discharge. Data was submitted electronically to the Division database.

**6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?**

YES [   ]      NO [   ]

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

Sites were dry so no parameters were reported, with the exception of 'No Discharge'.

**7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?**

YES [   ]      NO [ x ]

*Comments, including identity of monitoring site:*

During November 2002 the operation was encountering in-mine flows in excess of what could be used underground. The Operator was concerned the water quality would exceed the UPDES discharge limits and decided to route the in-mine flow into the Sedimentation Pond; allowing the suspended solids additional time to settle prior to discharging. No water was ever discharged. Later the routing was re-directed to UPDES sites 002 (mine discharge) so in-mine water would go directly into the C Canyon drainage, as permitted. No discharges have been required.

Page 3  
C/007/041-WQ02-4  
March 5, 2003

**8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?**

No further action is necessary for the 02-4 (4<sup>th</sup>) Quarter 2002.

O:\007041.WR\Water Quality\WQ\_02-4.doc